

Remarks/Argument

Claim Summary

By this Amendment, claim 1 has been amended, and no other claims have been added to or deleted from the application.

Accordingly, claims 1-37 remain pending in the application.

Restriction/Election

It is noted that claims 12-20, 22 and 24-37 have been withdrawn from consideration.

However, since dependent claims 12-13, 15-17 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, it is understood that these dependent claims would be allowed upon the eventual allowance of claim 1.

Specification

The “numerous grammatical errors” identified by the Examiner are actually correctly spelled British-style variants found in most English-language dictionaries. Nonetheless, submitted herewith is a substitute specification (and marked-up copy of the original specification) as required by the Examiner.

No new matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

By this Amendment, claim 1 has been revised to overcome the informality alleged by the Examiner.

35 U.S.C. ¶102

Claims 1-3 and 6-11 were variously rejected under 35 U.S.C. ¶102 as being anticipated by Campbell et al. (US 4990229), and/or Maeda et al. (EP 0676793), and/or Boswell (US 4810935), for the reasons stated at pages 3-5 of the Office Action. In each of these rejections, the Examiner states:

“It should be noted that attenuation of the ions which diffuse into the second chamber and approach the workpiece, by directing a proportion of the ions to a loss surface of either chamber will be produced.”

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s characterization of the Campbell et al., Maeda et al., and Boswell references.

Attention is directed to the attached DECLARATION OF DR. LESLIE LEA UNDER 37 C.F.R. ¶1.132 (“the Lea Declaration”).

As described at paragraph 4 of the Lea Declaration, each of Campbell et al., Maeda et al., and Boswell describe helicon type plasma sources which aim to increase the efficiency of energy transfer from the RF power supply to the plasma, i.e., to increase plasma (ion and electron) density.

Helicon type plasma sources such as those of the cited references achieve a result which is opposite to that attributed by the Examiner, and for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections under 35 U.S.C. ¶102.

35 U.S.C. ¶103

Several of the dependent claims were variously rejected under 35 U.S.C. ¶103 as being unpatentable over Campbell et al. or Maeda et al. or Boswell, in combination with various secondary references cited by the Examiner at pages 6-

14 of the Office Action. However, Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the same reasons as stated above in connection the rejections under 35 U.S.C. ¶102.

Conclusion

No other issues remaining, reconsideration and favorable action upon the present claims are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Leslie Michael LEA et al.

By:


Adam C. Volentine
Reg. No. 33,289

January 11, 2006

VOLENTINE FRANCOS & WHITT, PLLC
12200 Sunrise Valley Drive, Suite 150
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 715-0870